arXiv:0810.2193v1 [hep-th] 13 Oct 2008

The shear diffusion coefficient for generalized theories of gravity

Ram Brustein
Department of Physics, Ben-Gurion University,
Beer-Sheva, 84105 Israel
E-mail: ramyb@bgu.ac.il

A.J.M. Medved
Physics Department, University of Seoul,
Seoul 130-743 Korea
E-mail: allan@physics.uos.ac.kr

Abstract

Near the horizon of a black brane in Anti-de Sitter (AdS) space and near the AdS boundary, the long-wavelength fluctuations of the metric exhibit hydrodynamic behaviour. The gauge-gravity duality then relates the boundary hydrodynamics for generalized gravity to that of gauge theories with large finite values of 't Hooft coupling. We discuss, for this framework, the hydrodynamics of the shear mode in generalized theories of gravity in d+1 dimensions. It is shown that the shear diffusion coefficients of the near-horizon and boundary hydrodynamics are equal and can be expressed in a form that is purely local to the horizon. We find that the Einstein-theory relation between the shear diffusion coefficient and the shear viscosity to entropy ratio is modified for generalized gravity theories: Both can be explicitly written as the ratio of a pair of polarization-specific gravitational couplings but implicate differently polarized gravitons. Our analysis is restricted to the shear-mode fluctuations for simplicity and clarity; however, our methods can be applied to the hydrodynamics of all gravitational and matter fluctuation modes.

The long-wavelength fluctuations of the near-horizon metric of a black brane in Anti-de Sitter (AdS) space and the long-wavelength fluctuations of the metric near the AdS boundary can each be described by a translation-invariant (effective) thermal field theory. The equations of motion of either of these theories are hydrodynamic equations [1]. The relevant parameters — such as the temperature, shear viscosity, diffusion coefficient and entropy density — are intrinsic properties of the horizon and, as such, should be defined strictly in terms of the near-horizon metric. In spite of this apparent locality, considerable evidence has accumulated suggesting that these same horizon-specified quantities should be used for the boundary theory. Indeed, there are some concise expositions on this very point [1, 2, 3, 4]; with these having been able to establish the boundary field theory as describing a viscous fluid with precisely these hydrodynamic parameters.

The AdS boundary hydrodynamics can be related via the gauge–gravity duality to the hydrodynamics of strongly coupled gauge theories [5, 3]. The latter provides an interesting theoretical framework for studying relativistic hydrodynamics and may explain the experimental results of heavy-ion collisions, non-relativistic systems exhibiting superfluidity, *etc.* [6]. The boundary hydrodynamics has been most extensively studied using Einstein's theory of gravity, which corresponds to infinitely strong 't Hooft coupling on the gauge-theory side. As for applying the results to real physical systems that can be described by gauge theories, one really needs to know the outcomes for finite values of 't Hooft coupling. Then, since the strong-coupling expansion on the gauge-theory side corresponds to the derivative expansion on the gravity side, such an extension actually requires knowledge of the results for generalized theories of gravity. More specifically, one would first have to calculate the higher-derivative corrections to Einstein's gravity in string theory and then calculate the hydrodynamics of the corrected theory.

Here, we will provide a general prescription on how to perform the second stage for arbitrarily general gravitational corrections. First, we will establish a more direct connection between the near-horizon hydrodynamics and that of the AdS boundary. This task will be accomplished by showing that the thermal field-theoretic formalism developed for the boundary hydrodynamics can be directly translated into a calculation that is completely local to the horizon. Impor-

tantly, absolutely no information about the hydrodynamics is lost in this localization process. To extract the hydrodynamical parameters — such as the shear diffusion coefficient — at the AdS boundary, one solves the gravitational perturbation equations with incoming boundary conditions on the horizon and Dirichlet conditions on the outer boundary. However, it will be clear that one can similarly place the Dirichlet boundary conditions on radial shells anywhere in between the horizon and the boundary, including on the stretched horizon. After accounting for the effect of the gravitational redshift, one can see that the shear diffusion coefficients on all the shells are equal.

Next, we will go on to demonstrate how the aforementioned formalism can be extended to any generalized (or Einstein-corrected) theory of gravity. The hydrodynamic parameters of interest can be readily identified in terms of different components of a (generally) polarization-dependent gravitational coupling $\kappa_{\mu\nu}$. Recently, we have proposed a method for calculating these polarization-dependent couplings that is completely local to the horizon [7]. This followed from an examination of the two-derivative, second-order expansion of the action for the gravitons ($h_{\mu\nu}$), as described in [8]. In particular, the gravitational coupling can be identified on the basis that the replacement $h_{\mu\nu} \to \kappa_{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu}$ leads to a canonical kinetic term for the $\mu\nu$-polarized graviton. (This identification will be particularly relevant to the latter stages of our analysis.) It follows that any theory which is sensitive to the different polarizations can be expected — for instance — to alter the shear viscosity to entropy density ratio η/s from its "standard" (Einstein) value of $1/4\pi$. This claim was put into quantitative terms with the following proposal [7]: $\frac{\eta}{s} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{(\kappa_{rt})^2}{(\kappa_{xy})^2}$, where the subscripts on the gravitational couplings denote the implicated polarizations (to be defined more rigorously below). For Einstein's theory or any theory related to Einstein's by a field redefinition, $\kappa^2_{\mu\nu} = \kappa^2_E =$ constant (to be precise, one half of the $d+1$-dimensional Newton's constant).

Our particular objective will be to determine the shear diffusion coefficient D, for a generic gravity theory; this, by cognizance of it's relation to the pole structure of an appropriate thermal Green's function. It will be shown that, in general, the product DT differs from the ratio η/s; in conflict with the prediction of Einstein's theory. But this is *not* at all in conflict with the basic principles at work. As already stressed, each of the hydrodynamic parameters in play is sensitive to different polarizations and, therefore, will react differently to a non-trivial deviation from Einstein's theory. What is most signifi-

cant is the direct correlation between any of these parameters and the gravitational coupling for a very specific class of gravitons.

We will, for illustrative purposes, be somewhat specific about the choice of spacetime geometry and class of perturbations; however, our procedure (and outcomes) can readily be repeated for many other interesting cases.

Let us now proceed with the proposed analysis and consider a black p–brane in a $d+1$-dimensional (asymptotically) AdS spacetime. (Note that $d = p + 2 \geq 5$.) The associated metric is usually depicted in the Schwarzschild-like form $ds^2 = -\frac{r^2}{L^2} f(r) dt^2 + \frac{L^2}{r^2} \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + \frac{r^2}{L^2} \left(\sum_i^p dx_i^2 \right)$, where L is the AdS radius of curvature, $f(r) = 1 - (r_h/r)^{p+1}$ and r_h locates the black brane horizon. A simple change of coordinates, $u = r_h^2/r^2$, gives us another useful form

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r_h^2}{L^2 u} f(u) dt^2 + \frac{L^2}{4u^2} \frac{du^2}{f(u)} + \frac{r_h^2}{L^2 u} \left(\sum_i^p dx_i^2 \right) , \qquad (1)$$

where $f(u) = 1 - u^{\frac{p+1}{2}}$. The horizon and (outer) boundary are now located at $u = 1$ and $u = 0$ respectively, and $T = (p+1) r_h / 4\pi L^2$ can be identified (in any coordinate system) as the Hawking temperature.

To study brane hydrodynamics, one expands the metric, $g_{\mu\nu} \to \overline{g}_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$. In accordance with the standard conventions, the coordinate z is singled out as the direction of propagation of the graviton on the brane and one of the remaining transverse directions is denoted by x — any of which are interchangeable by virtue of the spatial isotropy of the brane. Obviously, any of the x coordinates could have been picked instead of z for the same reason. Given these conventions, $h_{\mu\nu} \sim \exp[-i\Omega t + iQz]$ (otherwise depending only on u), where $(\Omega, 0, ..., 0, Q)$ is the $p+1$–momentum of the graviton.

Under a suitable choice of gauge (namely, the radial gauge $h_{u\alpha} = 0$ for any α), it has been shown that the non-vanishing fluctuations separate into three decoupled classes; with these being commonly classified as the scalar, shear and sound modes [9]. The latter two are of particular interest, as the diffusion coefficient for the shear viscosity can be directly extracted from the pole structure of the associated correlator. Our current attention will be directed towards the shear channel, as an analogue calculation for the sound modes will yield the same basic outcome (albeit with some additional information) but with significantly more technical clutter. We will, however, briefly discuss the sound channel near the end of the article.

To determine the thermal correlator in question, one can proceed exactly as in [10, 11, 12], where much more elaborate discussions can be found. It is first necessary to identify a gauge-invariant combination of the shear-mode fluctuations $H_{tx} = (-1/g_{tt})h_{tx}$ and $H_{zx} = (1/g_{zz})h_{zx}$:

$$Z = qH_{tx} + \omega H_{zx} \ . \tag{2}$$

Here, $\omega = \Omega/2\pi T$ and $q = Q/2\pi T$ represent a dimensionless frequency and wavenumber respectively. Importantly, either of these parameters is vanishing (although not necessarily at the same rate) in the so-called hydrodynamic limit.

Restricting to the radial gauge and expanding out the Einstein field equations to the linear order of Z, one then schematically obtains $Z'' + A(\omega, q^2 f, u)Z' + B(\omega, q^2 f, u)Z = 0$, where a prime is a derivative with respect to the radial coordinate u. The coefficients A and B can be found in, for instance, eq. (3.14) of [12] for general p (although with conventions differing from ours) and eq. (4.26) of [11] for the $p = 3$ case. What is important, for our purposes, is not necessarily the explicit structure of the coefficients but that q appears uniquely in the combination $q^2 f(u)$. (Recall that $f(u)$ appears in the metric (1).)

One is instructed to solve this differential equation subject to a specific pair of boundary conditions. Firstly, the solution is constrained to be an incoming plane wave at the horizon $u = 1$. To the linear order of a perturbative expansion in ω and q, this condition imposes a solution of the form [11, 12]

$$Z = C f(u)^{-\frac{i\omega}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{iq^2}{2\omega} f(u) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{q^4 f^2}{\omega^2} \right) \right] \ . \tag{3}$$

Here, C is an integration constant that will be fixed by imposing the appropriate normalization condition.

Secondly, there is the so-called Dirichlet boundary condition, which has yet to be enforced. One can impose this condition at any point $0 \leq u^* < 1$; although it has become standard procedure to choose $u^* = 0$ and, thus, single out the boundary of AdS as a preferred place. However, this choice is not imperative. What the condition does necessitate is that $Z(u)$ (*prior* to its normalization) is vanishing as $u \to u^*$, which in turn imposes that $\omega = -iq^2 f(u^*)/2$ — *cf*, eq. (3). As an immediate consequence, we see that (in spite of first appearances) ω and $q^2 f(u^*)$ are of the same order in the hydrodynamic limit; that

is, $\omega^2 << q^2 f(u^*)$. (This last observation is very important to the discussion that follows.) One then further requires that Z be normalized to unity at u^*. For the case in hand, this can be achieved by the choice

$$C^{-1} = \left[1 + \frac{iq^2}{2\omega} f(u^*)\right] \ . \tag{4}$$

At this point, let us make it clear that the hydrodynamic or zero-frequency limit is supposed to be put into effect. Once this limit has been satisfied, it becomes a straightforward exercise to show that both Z and its correlator (see directly below) are radial invariants. (For a clear demonstration of this invariance, see [13].)

To learn about the two-point functions of the stress tensor, it is sufficient to study the correlator G_{ZZ} of the gauge-invariant variable Z. This correlator is directly extractable from the boundary gravitational action. To elucidate, one identifies the boundary residue of the canonical term in the bulk action, ZZ', as the correlator up to an inconsequential numerical factor. Following along these lines, one is able to deduce that $G_{ZZ} = -\lim_{u\to 0} K \frac{f(u)}{u[\omega^2 - f(u)q^2]} Z(u)Z'(u)$, where K is a dimensional constant that depends only on the metric length scales (r_h and L) and the gravitational coupling. Then, taking u and u^* to zero at the end of the calculation (and employing the Dirichlet condition to simplify the differentiation), one finds that $G_{ZZ} = K \frac{iq^2}{[\omega^2 - q^2][\omega + iq^2/2]}$ or, by invoking $\omega^2 \ll q^2$, $G_{ZZ} = K \frac{1}{\left[i\omega - \frac{q^2}{2}\right]}$.

One can immediately notice the pole in correlator, and, hence, the associated divergence. This singularity is not undesirable; rather, it can be viewed as a well-motivated expectation from the quasinormal-mode perspective of brane hydrodynamics [11]. Moreover, by using the standard hydrodynamic dispersion equation $\omega = -iDk^2 + \mathcal{O}(k^4)$ and recalling the previous scaling relations ($\omega = \Omega/2\pi T$ and $q = Q/2\pi T$), we can determine the diffusion coefficient as $D = 1/4\pi T$. The diffusion coefficient allows us, in turn, to fix the shear viscosity to entropy density ratio: $\eta/s = DT = 1/4\pi$ in agreement with the "usual" (but, as discussed earlier, not necessarily universal) outcome for brane hydrodynamics.

Let us now restrict our attention to near-horizon physics. After all, the stretched horizon — defined here as the region $1 - u^* \ll 1$ — is a perfectly legitimate choice. So far, we have made the claim that the Green's function should have the same functional form at both the stretched horizon and boundary (and all points in between), while

acting as a thermal correlator for a uniquely specified hydrodynamic system. Let us see how this actually plays out by repeating the calculation for G_{ZZ} but, this time, taking the near-horizon limit; that is, imposing $u,\ u^* \to 1$ (at the very end of the calculation). As before, all the unwarranted zeros in the calculation nicely cancel, leaving

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ZZ} &= \lim_{u,u^*\to 1} K \frac{iq^2 f(u)}{[\omega^2 - q^2 f(u)]\,[\omega + iq^2 f(u^*)/2]} \\ &= \lim_{u,u^*\to 1} K \frac{1}{\left[i\omega - \frac{q^2 f(u^*)}{2}\right]}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the second line follows from the hydrodynamic limit. Comparing the boundary result and (5), one can immediately see a difference; namely, the would-be pole structure has changed by a factor of $f(u^* \to 1)$.

We can address this new development as follows: The frequency ω and wavenumber q are coordinate-dependent constructs that will naturally experience the effect of a radially dependent gravitational redshift. So, how can we quantitatively discern the *relative* redshift given the sensitive (non-linear) relation between ω and q? The answer is remarkably simple: It is the structure of the correlator itself that tells us exactly how to determine the relative redshift! The hydrodynamic limit is, in actuality, an expansion in the ratio $q^2 f(u)/\omega$ — *cf*, eq. (3) — so that the limiting procedure will inevitably break down unless $q^2 f(u^*)/\omega < 1$. Let us also observe that $f(u)$ is monotonically increasing from its horizon value of $f(1) = 0$ to its boundary value of $f(0) = 1$. This means that, once imposed at the stretched horizon, the hydrodynamic expansion at an arbitrarily larger radius is only ensured to persist if q^2/ω scales as $1/f(u)$.

Taking ω to be fixed and unaffected by the redshift, so as not to disturb the incoming (horizon) boundary condition — which, when properly enforced, fixes a precise form for the solution at the surface of vanishing f — we then have that $\omega(u) = \omega_b$ and $q^2(u) = q_b^2/f(u)$. (The subscript b indicates the outer boundary value of the redshifted quantities.) Now, after applying the Dirichlet condition at the stretched horizon to the wavefunction (3), one can deduce a pole structure of $\omega_b = -iq_b^2/2$ and, accordingly, a diffusion coefficient of $D = 1/4\pi T$. In this way, we have finally achieved full compliance between the horizon and boundary calculations!

Moreover, it should be evident that, from the current perspective, there is really nothing special about either the outer boundary or the

black brane horizon. Which is to say, the Dirichlet-imposing surface could have, just as well, been placed at any point between the stretched horizon and outer boundary without jeopardizing the form of the pole structure and, hence, the value of the diffusion coefficient.

Next, let us extend considerations from Einstein gravity to a general theory of gravity. We will proceed to show that, for a general theory, the diffusion coefficient is modified in a very precise way. This form will be verified by two independent calculations; one of which is based on extracting the (modified) pole of the previously examined correlator and a second which considers the diffusion coefficient as a proportionality constant in a conservation equation for the (dissipative) stress-energy tensor.

By a generalized gravity theory, we have in mind a Lagrangian $\mathscr{L} = \frac{1}{32\pi\kappa_E^2}\left[R + \lambda\mathscr{L}_C\right]$ that allows for black brane solutions of the form (1). Here, $\mathscr{L}_C$ represents some correction to Einstein's Lagrangian and λ is a constant "tracking" parameter. Formally speaking, the correction need not be perturbative for our framework to apply. However, most (if not all) interesting cases in the literature can be formulated as such. For further details and explanations, the reader can consult [7] (also, [8]).

For a generalized gravity theory, the effective coupling can be expressed as $\frac{(\kappa_E)^2}{(\kappa_{\mu\nu})^2} = 1 \mp \frac{\lambda}{2}\left(\frac{\delta\mathscr{L}_C}{\delta R_{ab}{}^{cd}}\right)^{(0)}\hat{\epsilon}_{ab}\hat{\epsilon}^{cd}$, where $\{a,b,c,d\} \in \{\mu,\nu\}$ and $\hat{\epsilon}_{ab}$ is the binormal vector with regard to the specified pair of polarization directions. Any binormal is antisymmetric under the exchange of a and b, and normalized such that $\hat{\epsilon}_{ab}\hat{\epsilon}^{ab} = \mp 2$. A $\mp$ sign is only to be taken as negative when one of the directions (μ,ν) is timelike (this convention ensures the positivity of the coupling). The superscript (0) signifies that the calculation is always made on solution *and* on the horizon. Note that, at the order of the two-derivative expansion, the generalized couplings can be treated as (polarization-dependent) constants.

The basic premise now goes as follows: If Einstein's gravity is "non-trivially" modified (meaning that the corrected theory can *not* be related to Einstein's theory by a field redefinition), then the gravitational coupling is no longer as simple as κ_E^2 and can be expected to depend on the polarization of the gravitons being probed. For example, calculations of the black brane entropy are known to be sensitive to the $r-t$ (or $u-t$) polarized gravitons. Meanwhile, for the other hydrodynamic parameters of interest, the polarization directions will

depend on the particular channel being probed. More specifically, the scalar channel depends on the $x-y$ (polarized) gravitons, the shear channel depends on the $x-t$ and $x-z$ gravitons, and the sound channel depends on a particular combination of $t-t$, $t-z$, $x-x$, $y-y$, $z-z$ and $x-y$ fluctuations. (As before, z represents the direction of propagation on the brane, while x and y are any other transverse directions.)

We are now well equipped to discuss the diffusion coefficient for a generalized gravity theory. Our first method is based on looking at the pole structure of the correlator G_{ZZ}. One might well ask as to how this pole would be modified for a generalized theory. To answer this query, let us recall the identification of the gravitational coupling, $h_{\mu\nu} \to \kappa_{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu}$, as discussed earlier in the article. On this basis, it is quite natural to modify eq. (2) for the gauge-invariant variable Z as follows:

$$Z = q\kappa_{tx} H_{tx} + \omega \kappa_{zx} H_{zx} \ . \tag{6}$$

One can now discover the correct scaling properties of the hydrodynamical parameters in a way that resembles dimensional analysis: *First*, redefine the wavenumber and (in principle) the frequency with a scaling operation, *second*, reformulate the field equation and then the solution in terms of these rescaled parameters and, *third*, read off the revised pole structure. Before proceeding with the first step, let us fix ω (as previously explained) to preserve the incoming boundary condition at the horizon. Then, by exploiting the freedom (at this level of analysis) to change the normalization of Z, we obtain $Z = q\frac{\kappa_{tx}}{\kappa_{zx}} H_{tx} + \omega H_{zx} = \widetilde{q}\ H_{tx} + \omega H_{zx}$, with $\widetilde{q} \equiv q\frac{\kappa_{tx}}{\kappa_{zx}}$. Since the couplings can be treated as constants, the solution (3) remains basically unchanged and needs only to be rewritten in terms of the rescaled parameter; that is, $Z \sim f(u)^{-\frac{i\omega}{2}} \left[1 + \frac{i\widetilde{q}^2 f(u)}{2\omega}\frac{\kappa_{zx}^2}{\kappa_{tx}^2}\right]$. Now, applying the Dirichlet boundary condition just like before, we can readily extract the diffusion coefficient

$$D = \frac{\kappa_{zx}^2}{\kappa_{tx}^2}\frac{1}{4\pi T} \tag{7}$$

for a generalized theory of gravity.

For a second method, our result (7) can be shown to agree with the expectations of hydrodynamics as per the following argument: In hydrodynamics, one can obtain D by inspecting the x component of the conservation equation $\partial_\mu T^{\mu x} = 0$ for the dissipative stress-energy

tensor. (The relevant stress tensor is that of the $p+1$-brane theory. See [3] for a topical discussion.) Given the symmetries of the problem, this conservation equation reduces to $\partial_t T_{tx} = \partial_z T_{zx}$. The stress-energy tensor can then be expressed in terms of derivatives of the local fluid velocity u_μ. In linear hydrodynamics, $T_{zx} = -\eta \partial_z u_x$ whereby η is the same shear viscosity that appears in $T_{xy} = -\eta \partial_y u_x$. To lowest order, $T_{tx} = -(\rho + p) u_x$ such that ρ is the energy density of the fluid and p is its pressure. Now, *equilibrium thermodynamics* would imply that $T_{tx} = -sT u_x$, leading to $\partial_t u_x = \frac{\eta}{sT} \partial_z^2 u_x$ and then $DT = \eta/s$. In general, however, this is not the case. Rather, $T_{tx} = -(\rho + p + \delta) u_x \equiv \chi u_x$, with χ being the coefficient of heat conductance. (The correction δ is a purely relativistic effect that allows for an isothermal flow of heat in accelerated matter in the direction opposite to the acceleration [14, 15].) Combining these equations, one then obtains $\partial_t u_x = \frac{\eta}{\chi} \partial_z^2 u_x$. Now, using the Kubo formula, one would find $\chi \sim 1/\kappa_{tx}^2$ in the same way that $\eta \sim 1/\kappa_{xy}^2$. So that, appropriately scaling $\eta \to \eta(\kappa_{zx}/\kappa_E)^2$ and $\chi \to \chi(\kappa_{tx}/\kappa_E)^2$, one would make D scale as $D \to \left(\frac{\kappa_{zx}}{\kappa_{tx}}\right)^2 D$ — exactly as in eq. (7).

Let us briefly point out that analogous arguments can similarly be applied to the sound channel; from both the thermal correlator and hydrodynamic perspectives. A detailed account of the sound-mode calculations will be reported in a separate manuscript [16].

Finally, the informed reader might be concerned about an apparent conflict between our result and that of [17]. The authors of this paper studied a model with the (non-trivial) correction $\lambda \mathscr{L}_C = \lambda R_{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} R^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}$ and found that $DT = \eta/s$ for $d+1 = 5$ (or $p = 3$). We will now show that this agreement is actually a numerical coincidence specific to this particular dimensionality but is not generally true. As shown explicitly in our previous work [7] (where we carefully analyzed the very same model), $\frac{1}{(\kappa_{rt})^2} = \frac{1}{(\kappa_E)^2}\left[1 + \frac{2\lambda}{L^2} d(d-3)\right]$ and $\kappa_{xy}^2 = \kappa_E^2$. The same basic procedure can also be applied to obtain $\frac{1}{(\kappa_{tx})^2} = \frac{1}{(\kappa_E)^2}\left[1 - \frac{2\lambda}{L^2} d\right]$ and, of course, $\kappa_{zx}^2 = \kappa_E^2$. (It should be noted that none of these outcomes depends upon the particular choice of radial coordinate and, moreover, $\kappa_{u\nu}^2 = \kappa_{r\nu}^2$ for any ν.) It is now straightforward to compute and compare the ratios of interest. Namely, from $\frac{\eta}{s} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{(\kappa_{rt})^2}{(\kappa_{xy})^2}$ and eq. (7), we respectively obtain $\frac{\eta}{s} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\left[1 - \frac{2\lambda}{L^2} d(d-3)\right]$ and $DT = \frac{1}{4\pi}\left[1 - \frac{2\lambda}{L^2} d\right]$. Clearly, the agreement that was found between these two ratios is specific to the dimensionality $d+1 = 5$. Note that, under

even more general circumstances, we could not expect such agreement for any dimensionality.

Acknowledgments: The research of RB was supported by The Israel Science Foundation grant no 470/06. The research of AJMM is supported by the University of Seoul.

References

[1] P. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "Holography and hydrodynamics: Diffusion on stretched horizons," JHEP **0310**, 064 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0309213].

[2] A. Buchel and J. T. Liu, "Universality of the shear viscosity in supergravity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 090602 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0311175].

[3] See, for a review and more references as well, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "Viscosity, Black Holes, and Quantum Field Theory," Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **57**, 95 (2007) [arXiv:0704.0240 [hep-th]].

[4] A. O. Starinets, "Quasinormal spectrum and the black hole membrane paradigm," arXiv:0806.3797 [hep-th].

[5] G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "The shear viscosity of strongly coupled N = 4 supersymmetric Yang-Mills plasma," Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 081601 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0104066].

[6] See, for a recent review with many references, E. Shuryak, "Physics of Strongly coupled Quark-Gluon Plasma," arXiv:0807.3033 [hep-ph].

[7] R. Brustein and A. J. M. Medved, "The ratio of shear viscosity to entropy density in generalized theories of gravity," arXiv:0808.3498 [hep-th].

[8] R. Brustein, D. Gorbonos and M. Hadad, "Wald's entropy is equal to a quarter of the horizon area in units of the effective gravitational coupling," arXiv:0712.3206 [hep-th].

[9] G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "From AdS/CFT correspondence to hydrodynamics," JHEP **0209**, 043 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205052].

[10] D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, "Minkowski-space correlators in AdS/CFT correspondence: Recipe and applications," JHEP **0209**, 042 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205051].

[11] P. K. Kovtun and A. O. Starinets, "Quasinormal modes and holography," Phys. Rev. D **72**, 086009 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0506184].

[12] J. Mas and J. Tarrio, "Hydrodynamics from the Dp-brane," JHEP **0705**, 036 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0703093].

[13] N. Iqbal and H. Liu, "Universality of the hydrodynamic limit in AdS/CFT and the membrane paradigm," arXiv:0809.3808 [hep-th].

[14] C. Eckart, "The Thermodynamics of Irreversible Processes. III. Relativistic Theory of the Simple Fluid", Phys. Rev. **58**, 919 (1940).

[15] S. Weinberg, Ch. 2.11, in "Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity", *John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York (1972).*

[16] R. Brustein and A. J. M. Medved, manuscript in preparation.

[17] M. Brigante, H. Liu, R. C. Myers, S. Shenker and S. Yaida, "Viscosity Bound Violation in Higher Derivative Gravity," Phys. Rev. D **77**, 126006 (2008) [arXiv:0712.0805 [hep-th]].